

### REMARKS

The application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 2, 2009.

Claims 1-7 were pending. By this Amendment, claims 4, 6 and 7 have been canceled without disclaimer or prejudice to prosecuting their subject matter in one or more continuing application, claims 8-13 have been added, and claim 1 has been amended to clarify the claimed subject matter. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1-3, 5 and 8-13 would be pending with claim 1 being the sole independent claim.

#### *Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112*

The amendment in claim 1 clarifies that the weight percentages refer to the “curable resin composition following curing.”

#### *Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103*

Claims 1-3 and 5 were rejected over Onozawa et al. U.S. Patent 6,103,370 (“Onozawa”) in view of Nakamura et al. Published Application US 2002/0085274 (“Nakamura”). Applicants respectfully submit that the current claims are patentably distinct.

Claim 1 as amended recites that “the content of the ultraviolet absorber is 5 to 20 parts by weight based on 100 parts by weight of the ionizing radiation curable resin composition following curing.” An example of support can be found in paragraph [0027] of the originally filed application (paragraph [0026] in the published version US 2009/0042017). An example of support for the recited 200-400 formula weight (molecular weight) of the ultraviolet absorber can be found in paragraph [0023] of the application (paragraph [0022] in the published version).

In contrast, Onozawa mentions the possible addition of an ultraviolet absorber (column 3, lines 45-47) but proposes only the addition of 1 to 1.5 parts by weight of the absorber in Examples 1-5 and 9. No use of an ultraviolet absorber could be found in the other examples. No use of the claimed ultraviolet absorber in the combination of amended claim 1 could be found in Nakamura.

Claims 4, 6 and 7 have been canceled, so their rejection need not be discussed.

The remaining claims are in dependent form and are submitted to recite additional patentable features in combination with their respective parent claims but need not be specifically discussed in light of the submitted patentability of amended claim 1.

If a petition for an extension of time is required to make this response timely, this paper should be considered to be such a petition. The Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge any required fees in connection with this amendment, and to credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

If a telephone interview could advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 22, 2009



---

Ivan S. Kavrukov, Reg. No. 25,161  
Attorney for Applicant  
Cooper & Dunham LLP  
Tel.: (212) 278-0400